## Remarks

### Priority

Applicant apologizes for misstating the submission of the priority document in the last response. Anyhow, for some reasons, such a document is unavailable at this moment, and Applicant respectfully requests to postpone such a submission until the payment of the issue fee, if applicable.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,327,405 to Leyva et al. In response to these rejections, Applicants have amended claims 4, 5 and 8 and canceled claims 7 and 9 without prejudice.

Regarding independent claim 1, Examiner in Response to Arguments states that the use of shrinkage tubing is not novel in view of, for example, United States Patent Number 6,350,065 to Arima, United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0055913 to Winings and United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0133686 to Delrosso et al. However, Arima, Winings, Delrosso and Leyva fail to disclose the following limitations. First, a plurality of holders, each of which defines a plurality of passages parallel to each other and a plurality of parallel entrances. Second, each of said entrances is in communication with a corresponding said passage, and a width of said entrance is less than a diameter of the corresponding said passage. Third, the diameter of each of said passages is substantially equal to a diameter of each of the heat shrinkage pipes, and each of the heat shrinkage pipes is retained in a corresponding said passage of a corresponding holder. Therefore the dense wavelength division multiplexer module of the present invention as recited in claim 1 is structurally distinguished from that disclosed in Arima, Winings, Delrosso and Leyva. Applicants assert that the structure of the present invention is quite different from that of Arima,

Winings, Delrosso and Leyva, and that there is no known prior art which anticipates the above-enumerated limitations. Therefore claim 1 is novel over these references and the prior art.

Furthermore, applicants assert that the dense wavelength division multiplexer module defined in claim 1 of the present invention is unobvious in view of Arima, Winings, Delrosso and Leyva and the prior art. Each of the heat shrinkage pipes is pressed into a passage through an entrance of a corresponding holder in claim 1. The width of the entrance is less than a diameter of the corresponding passage. This structure of the holder can prevent the heat shrinkage pipe from producing optical loss due to microbending in all directions. The holder can hold the heat shrinkage pipes reliably and durably. A person of ordinary skill in the art could not have derived from the prior art including Arima, Winings, Delrosso and Leyva the dense wavelength division multiplexer module of the present invention. Thus claim 1 is unobvious over these references and the prior art.

In summary, it is submitted that independent claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 over Arima, Winings, Delrosso and Leyva and the prior art. Therefore dependent claim 2 should also be patentable.

Applicants have added the features of claims 7 and 9 into independent claim 4. Regarding amended claim 4, Leyva fails to disclose the following limitations. First, a plurality of retainers, each of which defines a passage and an entrance in a top surface thereof, wherein said entrance communicates with said passage, and a width of said entrance is less than a diameter of the corresponding said passage. Second, the diameter of said passage is substantially equal to a diameter of the sleeve of each of the dense wavelength division multiplexers, and said passage of a corresponding retainer retains the sleeve of a corresponding dense wavelength division multiplexer therein. Therefore the dense wavelength division multiplexer module of the present invention as recited in claim 4 is structurally distinguished from that disclosed in Leyva. Applicants assert that the structure of

the present invention is quite different from that of Leyva, and that claim 4 is novel over this reference.

Furthermore, applicants assert that the dense wavelength division multiplexer module defined in claim 4 of the present invention is unobvious in view of Leyva. The paired fiber ends of the coupler of Leyva are epoxied in longitudinal slots in each ferrule 30, 31, and the epoxy is in contact with bare glass on the inside ends of the ferrules 30, 31. As a result, the splices of Leyva are sealed in the ferrules 30, 31 by means of epoxy, which is unduly time-consuming and adversely affects the optical characteristics of the module. It is an object of the present invention to solve this problem of using epoxy, and thus the retainer retains the sleeve of a corresponding dense wavelength division multiplexer of the present invention reliably and durably without using epoxy. A person of ordinary skill in the art could not have derived from Leyva the dense wavelength division multiplexer module of the present invention. Thus claim 4 is unobvious over the reference.

In summary, it is submitted that independent claim 4 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 over Leyva. Therefore the corresponding dependent claims 5, 8 and 19 should also be patentable.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leyva as applied to claims 1 and 4 above.

Claims 14-17 directly or indirectly depend from claim 4, and claim 4 is asserted to be patentable in view of Leyva as detailed above. Therefore claims 14-17 should be allowable.

Claims 6, 11-12, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leyva as applied to claims 1 and 4 in the prior office action and in further view of United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0133686 to

Delrosso et al.

Claim 4 is asserted to be patentable in view of Leyva as detailed above. Furthermore, Applicants assert that claim 4 is patentable over the combination of Leyva and Delrosso, for the same or similar reasons as those detailed above in relation to claim 1. Claims 6 and 11-12 directly or indirectly depend from claim 4, and therefore should also be allowable.

Independent claim 21 defines a plurality of retainers holding the sleeves of DWDMs in position in the interior area of the module, and a plurality of holders retaining a plurality of shrinkage pipes in a periphery of the module. With respect, Examiner does not clearly indicate which elements of Leyva and Delrosso are a) the retainers, b) the DWDMs, c) the holders and d) the shrinkage pipes, nor where any such elements are located, i.e., in the interior area or in the periphery. In these circumstances, applicants assert that the combination of the cited references indeed cannot provide teaching or suggestion that render obvious the above-described limitations and the invention recited in claim 21. Applicants contend that the dense wavelength division multiplexer module recited in claim 21 of the present invention is patentable in view of Leyva and Delrosso. Further, because claim 22 depends from claim 21, claim 22 should also be patentable.

Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leyva as applied to claims 1 and 4 above and in (further) view of United States Patent Number 6,282,360 to Milanowski et al.

Examiner states that Leyva discloses a DWDM module with a casing, parallel ribs and entrances, that Milanowski teaches an organizing structure that has ribs to hold optical fibers with a straight innermost end and an arcuate outermost end, and that it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the module of Leyva to include the arcuate portions of the fiber holder of Milanowski to prevent optical losses due to microbending.

However, claim 3 of the present invention discloses different features to those of the prior art detailed by Examiner. That is, the dense wavelength division multiplexer module of claim 1 further comprises a plurality of retainers; wherein each of the dense wavelength division multiplexers comprises a sleeve, each of the retainers retains the sleeve of a corresponding dense wavelength division multiplexer therein, and the retainers are secured in the array of ribs. Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art features relied upon by Examiner are not relevant and do not support Examiner's conclusion of obviousness. Applicants request that the rejection be removed and the claim allowed.

Similarly, claim 18 of the present invention discloses different features to those of the prior art detailed by Examiner. That is, the motherboard of the base of the dense wavelength division multiplexer module in accordance with claim 6 forms a plurality of projections disposed close to corresponding sidewalls of the frame, each of the projections comprises a main portion and two end portions perpendicularly extending from opposite ends of the main portion toward a proximate one of the corresponding sidewalls of the frame, and each of the holders is secured in a space defined between the end portions and the main portion of a corresponding projection, and the proximate sidewall of the frame. Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art features relied upon by Examiner are not relevant and do not support Examiner's conclusion of obviousness. Applicants request that the rejection be removed and the claim allowed.

Finally, the other references listed by Examiner in the Notice of References Cited also fail to disclose said unique features of the present invention as detailed above. Therefore, a fortiori, claims 1-6, 8, 11-12, 14-19 and 21-22 should be allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Wu et al.

By _____
Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137



 